

REMARKS

The following remarks are an exact duplicate of those submitted on August 4, 2008, and are hereby resubmitted for convenience in this response to the notice of non-compliance under 37 CFR 1.121.

The Office Action dated March 4, 2008 and the Advisory Action dated June 12, 2008 have been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 12, 22 and 25 have been amended under 35 U.S.C. §1.114 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 12-26 are presently pending, of which claims 12, 22 and 25 are independent claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 12-26 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rankin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,879,838) in view of Hasebe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,946,991). The Office Action took the position that all of the claimed subject matter recited in claims 12-26 is taught or suggested by Rankin or Hasebe. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Rankin does not teach or suggest "the estimated location of the mobile device used to determine the at least one prayer time is based on the coverage area of the at least one base station and a current cell identification (Cell ID) parameter assigned to the mobile device, wherein said Cell ID is a parameter in the translation table which identifies the Cell ID as an estimated location parameter of the mobile station based on the coverage area of the base station, and where the translation table is used to match a corresponding

prayer time to the Cell ID by matching the coverage area of the base station with at least one of the time of year and the time of day which are also parameters in at least one of the translation table and a look-up table”, as recited, in part, in independent claim 12 and similarly in independent claim 22 and 25.

The Advisory Action disclosed that “since base stations, in cellular system, have “CELL ID” and such “cell id” is used to locate subscribers, as indicated above by the Applicant’s disclosure, the Examiner maintains...Rankin meets the Applicant’s argued claimed limitations.” Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s reasoning and submits that by relying on the Applicant’s disclosure to teach an admittedly deficient claim recitation of Rankin and Hasebe (e.g., a “Cell ID” and “using a Cell ID to locate a mobile station”) is an improper manner in which to reject the claims. The Examiner’s specification cannot be used as a blueprint to piece together prior art references to arrive at the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Grain Processing Corp. v. American Maize-Products Co.*, 840 F.2d 902, 907, 5 USPQ2d 1788, 1792 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The fact remains that the combination of references do not teach all of the subject matter of the claims because it is admitted by the Advisory Action that Rankin and Hasebe both do not disclose a Cell ID or a Cell ID being used to perform an operation related to locating a mobile station. However, as indicated below, Applicant has made further amendments to the claims to further prosecution and to better clarify how the Cell ID is used to help provide prayer times to the mobile device.

Regardless of the improper rejections to the claims as noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the teachings of Rankin or Hasebe teach or suggest “the estimated location of the mobile device used to determine the at least one prayer time is

based on the coverage area of the at least one base station and a current cell identification (Cell ID) parameter assigned to the mobile device, wherein said Cell ID is a parameter in the translation table which identifies the Cell ID as an estimated location parameter of the mobile station based on the coverage area of the base station, and where the translation table is used to match a corresponding prayer time to the Cell ID by matching the coverage area of the base station with at least one of the time of year and the time of day which are also parameters in at least one of the translation table and a look-up table", as recited, in part, in independent claim 12 and similarly in independent claim 22 and 25.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the subject matter recited in independent claims 12, 22 and 25, and by virtue of dependency, those claims dependent thereon, clearly recite subject matter that is not taught by Rankin or Hasebe. The withdrawal of all outstanding rejections and an allowance of all outstanding claims 12-26 are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claim recites subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited art. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 12-26 be withdrawn, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

With best regards,



Kamran Emdadi
Registration No. 58,823

Emdadi Patent Law
2025 Beacon Place
Reston VA 20191
571.437.7660

Date: August 21, 2008